arXiv:quant-ph/0302153v1 20 Feb 2003

A prime factorization based on quantum dynamics on a spin ensemble (I)

Xijia Miao*

Abstract

In this paper it has been described how to use the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics to solve the prime factorization problem on a spin ensemble without any quantum entanglement. The ensemble quantum computation for the prime factorization is based on the basic principle that both a closed quantum system and its ensemble obey the same unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics if there is not any decoherence effect in both the quantum system and its ensemble. It uses the NMR multiple-quantum measurement techniques to output the quantum computational results that are the inphase multiple-quantum spectra of the spin ensemble. It has been shown that the inphase NMR multiple-quantum spectral intensities used to search for the period of the modular exponential function may reduce merely in a polynomial form as the qubit number of the spin ensemble. The time evolution process of the modular exponential operation on the quantum computer obeys the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics and hence the computational output is governed by the quantum dynamics. This essential difference between the quantum computer and the classical one could be the key point for the quantum computation outperforming the classical one in the prime factorization on a spin ensemble without any quantum entanglement. It has been shown that the prime factorization based on the quantum dynamics on a spin ensemble is locally efficient at least. This supports the conjecture that the quantum dynamics could play an important role for the origin of power of quantum computation and quantum entanglement could not be a unique resource to achieve power of quantum computation in the prime factorization.

---

* Address: MSKCC, New York, NY 10017 and 9 Marney Street, Cambridge, MA 02141, USA. E_mail: miaoxijia@yahoo.com

1. Introduction

The prime factorization is an important problem that has made it a rapid development for the quantum computation and quantum information science. The Shor$'$s quantum algorithm [1, 2] proposed first in 1994 to factorize efficiently a large composite integer can provide a possibility to break down the current public key cryptography such as the RSA cryptosystem. This fact has stimulated a great interesting in the quantum computation and information science and has promoted a large advance in the quantum computation [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. This factorization algorithm could not come along for a short time most because the present-day quantum systems have not an enough long decoherence time to run the algorithm, although a preliminary experiment verification for the Shor$'s$ algorithm on an NMR quantum computer was reported [8]. The factoring algorithm is based on a pure-state quantum system. It has been suggested due to this powerful quantum algorithm that the exponential speedup power of the quantum computation over the classical counterpart could be attributed to quantum entanglement of a quantum system [9]. One reason for it is that quantum entanglement is a uniquely feature differing the quantum effect from the classical effect and most powerful quantum algorithms nowadays involve in the quantum entanglement [9]. Another is the well-known fact that quantum entanglement plays a key important role in quantum communication [10, 11]. However, it has never been proved rigorously that quantum entanglement is the sole origin of power of quantum computation, and a number of recent works [12, 13] have showed that the power of quantum computation may not originate from quantum entanglement, although no work shows so far that the exponential speedup in the factoring algorithm may be independent of quantum entanglement. Very recently, an improved factoring algorithm has been proposed [14]. It has been shown that a quantum system consisting of an auxiliary pure-state qubit and $\log_2 N$ mixed qubits is still sufficient to implement efficiently the prime factorization [14, 15]. But it also has been argued [14, 16] that quantum entanglement could play an important role in achievement of the exponential speedup in the algorithm since there still exists quantum entanglement in such a system. The exponential speedup achieved on such a system really does not provide any certain answer whether or not quantum entanglement plays an important role in the exponential speedup of quantum computation over the classical computation.

Fortunately, there are a lot of quantum ensembles in nature in which there is not any quantum entanglement. These quantum ensembles include the conventional NMR nuclear spin ensembles at room temperature [17], which are also macroscopic quantum ensembles [18]. Quantum entanglement in a spin ensemble may be controlled by temperature of the spin ensembles. It is easy to keep any mixed state of a spin ensemble even with a larger number of qubits in a nonentanglement state by setting the spin ensemble at a higher temperature [17], but temperature of a spin ensemble should be as low as possible in order to make the NMR signal-to-noise ratio high enough for any NMR experiments. Such an ensemble without any quantum entanglement could be a typical system to judge whether or not quantum entanglement is the origin of power of quantum computation. Actually, if any quantum algorithm such as the factoring algorithm could be implemented efficiently in such a quantum ensemble without any quantum entanglement one could conclude certainly that quantum entanglement is not the unique origin of power of quantum computation. This is one of the reasons why the NMR spin ensembles are chosen as the typical systems to study the origin of power of quantum computation in the paper. Another reason is that the NMR spin ensembles usually have a long relaxation time and are simple and easy to be controlled and manipulated at will in experiments, and there are a large number of well-developed experimental techniques in the NMR spectroscopy [19, 20] which all can be adopted in NMR quantum computation.

The unitary dynamic method of quantum mechanics has been proposed to solve efficiently the quantum search problem and the hard NP-problems [21, 22, 23, 24]. It has been shown that the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics is the base of ensemble quantum computation [22, 23, 24]. The basis principle behind the ensemble quantum computation is that both a closed quantum system and its ensemble obey the same unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics if there is not any decoherence in both the quantum system and its ensemble. This basis principle allows one to use quantum ensembles such as the spin ensembles without any quantum entanglement to do real quantum computation. Recently, the NMR multiple-quantum measurement techniques have been used to output quantum computational results which are the inphase multiple-quantum coherence spectra in a spin ensemble [24]. The NMR measurement for the inphase multiple-quantum coherences need not an exponential resource when the multiple-quantum coherences in the spin ensemble are created efficiently by any quantum circuit. Therefore, both the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics and the multiple-quantum measurement techniques may form the base for the scalable ensemble quantum computation [24]. In this paper both the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics and the multiple-quantum measurement techniques have been exploited to solve the prime factorization problem on a spin ensemble without any quantum entanglement. The purpose for it is to study how the quantum dynamics plays an important role on the origin of power of quantum computation in the prime factorization on a spin ensemble.

2. Eigenvalues and eigenvectors of modular exponential operation

The integer factoring problem can be reduced to the order-finding problem, while the latter is closely related to the unitary transformation of the modular exponential operation in the quantum factoring algorithms based on pure quantum states [5, 6]:

$$U(y,r,N)|x\rangle = |xy \bmod N\rangle,\ x = 0,1,...,N-1. \tag{1}$$

The transformation $U(y,r,N)$ is a unitary transformation only when the numbers y and N are coprime to each other. The explicit form of the unitary transformation is dependent only on the numbers y and N. This unitary transformation hides the period r of the modular exponential function $f(m) = f(y,m,N) = y^m \bmod N$ that is a periodic function: $f(m) = f(m+r)$. The period r need to be determined in the order-finding problem. The modular exponential unitary transformation (1) can be efficiently implementable [1, 2, 5, 6]. Given a number y prime to the integer N the unitary transformation $U(y,r,N)$ can be determined explicitly from Eq.(1). Then the Hamiltonian corresponding to the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ can be expressed in form

$$H(y,r,N) = i \ln U(y,r,N). \tag{2}$$

Since the order of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ is r, i.e., $U(y,r,N)^r = E$ (the unity operator) there are r different eigenvalues for the unitary operator: $\Lambda_k = \exp(-i2\pi k/r)$, $k = 0,1,...,r-1$. Then the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ also have r different eigenvalues: $\lambda_k = 2\pi k/r$, $k = 0,1,...,r-1$. According to the Cayley-Hamilton theorem of linear algebra [25] the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ of Eq.(2) can be expanded as

$$H(y,r,N) = \sum_{k=0}^{r-1} \alpha_k U(y,r,N)^k. \tag{3}$$

Now suppose that the common eigenvectors of the unitary operator and its

Hamiltonian are denoted as $\{|\Psi_k\rangle\}$, then their eigen-equations are respectively given by

$$U(y,r,N)|\Psi_k\rangle = \Lambda_k|\Psi_k\rangle \tag{4a}$$

and

$$H(y,r,N)|\Psi_k\rangle = \lambda_k|\Psi_k\rangle. \tag{4b}$$

By the operator equation (3) and the eigenvector $|\Psi_k\rangle$ one obtains from Eq.(4b)

$$\lambda_k = \sum_{l=0}^{r-1} \alpha_l \exp(-i2\pi kl/r). \tag{5a}$$

Obviously, both the eigenvalues $\{\lambda_k = 2\pi k/r\}$ and the coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$ form a pair of Fourier transform, and according to the Fourier transform relation (5a) one can determine explicitly the coefficients $\{\alpha_k\}$,

$$\alpha_k = \sum_{l=0}^{r-1} \tfrac{2\pi l}{r^2} \exp(i2\pi kl/r). \tag{5b}$$

Then inserting Eq.(5b) into Eq.(3) the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ is written as

$$H(y,r,N) = \sum_{k=0}^{r-1}\sum_{l=0}^{r-1} \tfrac{2\pi l}{r^2} \exp(i2\pi kl/r) U(y,r,N)^k. \tag{6}$$

The Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ above is derived in detailed from its corresponding unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ of Eq.(1) partly due to that the manipulation for a Hamiltonian is usually more convenient than for a unitary operator in a complex spin ensemble [19, 20]. There is an important property for the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ and unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ of the modular exponential operation (1) according to the definitions of the unitary operator (1) and its Hamiltonian (2) that the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)^m$ can be written as

$$U(y,r,N)^m = U(y^m,r,N) = \exp[-imH(y,r,N)]. \tag{7}$$

The first equality in Eq.(7) shows that quantum circuit of the unitary operation $U(y,r,N)^m$ can be efficiently constructed even when the integer m is a huge number, e.g., $m = r$, while the second equality shows that the integer m really acts as the discrete time variable in the dynamical process of the modular exponential operation.

It is usually convenient to calculate time evolution of a spin ensemble under a spin Hamiltonian if the eigenvectors and their eigenvalues of the spin Hamiltonian are determined. The common eigenvectors of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ and its Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ can be constructed explicitly using the eigenequations (4a) and (4b). They should be a linear combination of the conventional computational base $\{|k\rangle\}$. Since the period is r for the modular exponential function $f(m) = f(y, m, N) = y^m \bmod N$, that is, there is the lowest integer r such that $f(y, r, N) = 1$, it follows from the unitary transformation (1) that for a given integer x one has

$$U(y, r, N)|xy^m \bmod N\rangle = |(xy^{(m+1) \bmod r}) \bmod N\rangle, \tag{8}$$

where $m = 0, 1, ..., r-1$. It is clear that the basis subset $\{|xy^k \bmod N\rangle;$ $k = 0, 1, ..., r-1\}$ form a closed state subset $S(x)$ under the unitary transformation $U(y, r, N)$. For convenience, the dimension of the state subset $S(x)$ is denoted as r_x since it may depend on the integer x. Obviously, for $x = 1$ the dimension r_x of the subset $S(x)$ equals r exactly. The dimension r_x is always smaller than or equal to the period r for any integer $x : 0 \leq x < N-1$, that is, the period r is the maximum dimension in the subsets $S(x)$ for all possible x, $0 \leq x < N-1$ also because according to the definition (1) the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$ has the order r and is independent of any x, $0 \leq x < N-1$. In particular, $r_x = 1$ when $x = 0$ and its subset $S(0) = \{|0\rangle\}$. It follows from Eq.(8) that an arbitrary eigenstate $|\Psi_s(x)\rangle$ of the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$ of the subset $S(x)$ can be expressed as a linear combination of the basis of the subset $S(x)$,

$$|\Psi_s(x)\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{r_x-1} c(r_x, s, k)|xy^k \bmod N\rangle, \; s = 0, 1, .., r_x - 1. \tag{9}$$

Inserting the eigenstate (9) into the eigenequation (4a) one obtains

$$\sum_{k=0}^{r_x-1} \exp(-i2\pi s/r) c(r_x, s, k)|xy^k \bmod N\rangle$$
$$- \sum_{k=0}^{r_x-1} c(r_x, s, k)|xy^{k+1} \bmod N\rangle = 0. \tag{10}$$

If dimension r_x of the subset $S(x)$ is r exactly then all r states $\{|xy^m \bmod N\rangle$, $m = 0, 1, ..., r-1\}$ are independent of each other. Then the recursive relations for the coefficients $c(r, s, k)$ can be set up by the eigenequation (10)

$$\exp(-i2\pi s/r) c(r, s, k) = c(r, s, k-1), \; k = 1, 2, ..., r-1;$$

and

$$\exp(-i2\pi s/r) c(r, s, 0) = c(r, s, r-1).$$

Therefore, the coefficients $c(r, s, k)$ are determined by

$$c(r, s, k) = \exp(i2\pi sk/r) c(r, s, 0), \, k = 1, 2, ..., r-1. \tag{11a}$$

With the help of the orthonormal relations for the eigenstate $|\Psi_s(x)\rangle$ and the basis $|xy^k \bmod N\rangle$: $\langle\Psi_s(x)|\Psi_s(x)\rangle = 1$ and $\langle xy^k \bmod N|xy^{k'} \bmod N\rangle = \delta_{kk'}$ it is easy and straightforward to find the coefficient $c(r, s, 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r}}$ (here $c(r, s, 0)$ is taken as a real). Then the other coefficients are given explicitly by Eq.(11a) once the coefficient $c(r, s, 0)$ is known. Generally the modular exponential function $f(x,y,m,N)=xy^m \bmod N$ $(x\neq 0)$ may have the same period r as the function $f(y,m,N)=y^m \bmod N$, but besides the period r the function $f(x,y,m,N)$ may also have other periods r_x different from r for some given x [14]. Then in the case of $r_x\leq r$ the eigenstate subset $\{|\Psi_s(x)\rangle\}$ of Eq.(9) of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ has both two period r_x and r, and the period r_x divides r because there must be the relations: $|\Psi_0(x)\rangle = |\Psi_r(x)\rangle = |\Psi_{lr_x}(x)\rangle$, l is some integer. The eigenvalues of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ belonging to the eigenstates of Eq.(9) can be obtained using the eigenequation (4a),

$$U(y,r,N)^{r_x}|\Psi_s(x)\rangle = \Lambda_s^{r_x}(x)|\Psi_s(x)\rangle = |\Psi_s(x)\rangle,$$

where the second equality is due to the period r_x, that is, $|xy^k \bmod N\rangle = |xy^{k+r_x} \bmod N\rangle$. Therefore, the eigenvalues are given by

$$\Lambda_s(x)=\exp(-i2\pi s/r_x),\ s=0,1,...,r_x-1.$$

Again using the eigenequation (4a) and the eigenvalues $\Lambda_s(x)$ one can set up the recursive relations for the coefficients $c(r_x,s,k)$ of the eigenstate $|\Psi_s(x)\rangle$ similar to Eq.(11a) and hence the coefficients $c(r_x,s,k)$ are determined

$$c(r_x,s,k)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{r_x}}\exp(i2\pi sk/r_x),\ k,s=0,1,...,r_x-1. \qquad (11b)$$

Then by using the coefficients of Eq.(11a) and Eq.(11b) one obtains from Eq.(9) the common eigenstates of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ and Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ [4, 6, 7],

$$|\Psi_s(x)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_x}}\sum_{k=0}^{r_x-1}\exp(i2\pi sk/r_x)|xy^k \bmod N\rangle,\ s=0,1,..,r_x-1. \qquad (12a)$$

Obviously, the eigenstate set $\{|\Psi_s(x)\rangle\}$ and the basis set $\{|xy^k \bmod N\rangle\}$ form a pair of Fourier transforms, and the inverse Fourier transform of Eq.(12a) generates the basis $|xy^k \bmod N\rangle$ as

$$|xy^k \bmod N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_x}}\sum_{k=0}^{r_x-1}\exp(-i2\pi sk/r_x)|\Psi_s(x)\rangle \qquad (12b)$$

The Fourier transforms of Eq.(12a) and (12b) are helpful for calculating in an analytical form the time evolution of a spin ensemble under the unitary operation $U(y,r,N)$. This can be seen in next sections.

Since every integer k in $0\leq k<N$ always can be expressed as $k=xy^m \bmod N$ by choosing suitably the integers x and m, where the integer y is coprime to and smaller than the integer N, then the conventional computational basis can be expressed either as $\{|k\rangle,\ k=0,1,2,...,N-1\}$ or as $\{|xy^m \bmod N\rangle,\ m=0,1,2,...,r_x-1;\ x=0,1,...,N-1\}$. One can classify the conventional computational basis $\{|k\rangle\}$ or $\{|xy^m \bmod N\rangle\}$ according to the transformation property of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$. For example,

for a given integer x one can generate a basis subset $S(x) = \{|xy^m \bmod N\rangle, m = 0, 1, ..., r_x - 1\}$. The whole Hilbert state space with dimension N then is divided into t independent and orthogonal basis subsets $S(x)$ with different integers $x : x_0 \leq x_1 \leq ... \leq x_{t-1}$. Clearly, $N = r_{x_0} + r_{x_1} + ... + r_{x_{t-1}}$. Therefore, the conventional computational basis set also can be expressed in the simpler form $\{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle, k = 0, 1, ..., r_{x_l} - 1; l = 0, 1, ..., t - 1\}$ according to the transformation property of the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$ (1), which is also equivalent to the conventional computational basis set $\{|k\rangle\}$. In particular, for $x_0 = 0$ the subset $S(x_0) = \{|0\rangle\}$ with $r_{x_0} = 1$ and for $x_1 = 1$ the subset $S(x_1)$ is an $r-$dimensional subset. Actually, besides the subset $S(x_1)$ there may be also other $r-$dimensional subsets $S(x)$ with $x > 1$. Suppose that there are d independent $r-$dimensional subsets including $x_1 = 1$ and $x > 1$ in the $N-$dimensional Hilbert space. There are rd computational basis that belong to the $r-$dimensional subsets among the N computational basis, and the rest $N - rd$ basis are of those subsets with dimensions r_x smaller than r. How many the computational basis belong to the $r-$dimensional subsets in all N computational basis? This can be answered by the theorem (Parker and Plenio [14]): Given two prime numbers p and q, $N = pq$, r is defined as the period of the modular exponential function $f(m) = f(y, m, N) = y^m \bmod N$ for an arbitrary integer y, then there are at least $(p - 1)(q - 1)$ positive integers x less than and coprime to the integer N such that the modular exponential function $g(m) = f(x, y, m, N) = xy^m \bmod N$ has the minimum period equal to r for $0 \leq y \leq N - 1$.

Actually, the unitary transformation (1) shows that the conventional computational basis set $\{|k\rangle\}$ is also equivalent to the basis set $\{|xy^k \bmod N\rangle, x = 0, 1, ..., N - 1\}$ for any given integer k. Then according to the theorem [14] number of the computational basis that satisfy $xy^{k+r_x} = xy^k \bmod N$ with $r_x < r$ is $(p + q - 1)$ at most in the whole basis set $\{|xy^k \bmod N\rangle, x = 0, 1, ..., N - 1\}$. This also means that number of the computational basis that belong to those basis sets $S(x)$ with dimensions $r_x < r$ is at most $(p + q - 1)$ in the complete basis set $\{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle, k = 0, 1, ..., r_{x_l} - 1; l = 0, 1, ..., t - 1\}$. Therefore, the number $N - rd$ of the computational basis of those subsets with dimensions r_x smaller than r is at most $(p + q - 1)$, and the number rd of the computational basis of the $r-$dimensional subsets in the $N-$dimensional $(N = pq)$ Hilbert space is at least $pq - (p + q - 1)$.

Finally, it is also important to know the orthonormal relations for the eigenstates $|\Psi_s(x_k)\rangle$ and the conventional computational basis $|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle$ for conveniently calculating the time evolution of a spin ensemble under the unitary operation $U(y, r, N)$,

$$\langle \Psi_k(x_l) | \Psi_{k'}(x_{l'}) \rangle = \delta_{kk'} \delta_{ll'}, \tag{13a}$$

$$\langle x_l y^k \bmod N | x_{l'} y^{k'} \bmod N \rangle = \delta_{kk'} \delta_{ll'}. \tag{13b}$$

where $k, k' = 0, 1, ..., r_{x_l} - 1$ and $l, l' = 0, 1, ..., t - 1$.

3. Time evolution process of modular exponential operation

Generally the prime number N is not equal to some power of two. Suppose that the prime number $N = pq$ satisfies $2^{n-1} \leq N < 2^n$. For simplifying calculation of the time evolution of a spin ensemble during the modular exponential operation the NMR quantum computer could be chosen conveniently as a heteronuclear spin ensemble $I_1 I_2 ... I_{n_i} S_1 S_2 ... S_n$ (denoted briefly as $I_{n_i} S_n$) that consists of n_i spin-1/2 I nuclei and n spin-1/2 S nuclei and particularly $n_i = 1, 2, ...$ This is just like the pure-state Shor$'s$ factoring algorithm using two memories [1, 2]. The conditional modular exponential operation $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)$ applying to the spin system $I_{n_i} S_n$ is built up with the unitary transformation of Eq.(1),

$$U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N) |a\rangle |x\rangle = \{ \begin{array}{l} |a\rangle (U(y, r, N) |x\rangle), \ x = 0, 1, ..., N-1; \ a = 1 \\ |a\rangle |x\rangle, \ x = 0, 1, ..., N-1; \ a = 0 \\ |a\rangle |x\rangle, \ x = N, N-1, ..., 2^n - 1; \ a = 0, 1 \end{array} \tag{14}$$

where the quantum states $|a\rangle$ and $|x\rangle$ belong to the kth spin I and all n spins S_n of the spin system $I_{n_i} S_n$, respectively. The modular exponential operation $U(y, r, N)$ is applied only to those quantum state $|x\rangle$ of the spin subsystem S_n with $x < N$ only if the kth $I-$spin quantum state $|a\rangle = |1\rangle$. It can turn out that the Hamiltonian corresponding to the unitary operator $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)$ (14) may be expressed as

$$H_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N) = E_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes E_{k-1} \bigotimes (\tfrac{1}{2} E_k - I_{kz}) \bigotimes E_{k+1} \bigotimes ... E_{n_1} \bigotimes H_{S_n}(y, r, N) \tag{15}$$

where $I_{kz} |0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} |0\rangle$ ($\hbar = 1$) and $I_{kz} |1\rangle = -\frac{1}{2} |1\rangle$, and the Hamiltonian $H_{S_n}(y, r, N)$ applied only to the subsystem S_n is defined as

$$H_{S_n}(y, r, N) = H(y, r, N) \bigoplus Z_{L-N} \tag{16}$$

where Z_{L-N} is the $(L-N) \times (L-N)-$dimensional zero operator. It is easy to prove according to Eq.(7) that the conditional modular exponential operation $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ can be expressed as

$$U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)^m = U_{I_k S_n}(y^m, r, N) = \exp[-im H_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)]. \tag{17}$$

The unitary operator $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ can be constructed efficiently for any integer m because the unitary operator $U_{I_k S_n}(y^m, r, N)$ can be constructed efficiently. It is known from Eq.(17) that the power m in the unitary operator $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ really acts as the discrete time variable in the dynamical process of the conditional modular exponential operation. Note that any pair of the Hamiltonians $H_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)$ (15) with different I-spin operators I_{kz} $(k = 1, 2, ..., n_i)$ commute each other. A more general conditional modular exponential operation can be constructed by

$$U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N) = \prod_{k=1}^{n_1} U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N), \tag{18}$$

and it is easy to prove that the relation (17) also is met for the general conditional modular exponential operation (18). The Hamiltonian of the unitary operator $U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)$ therefore is written as

$$H_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} H_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N). \tag{19}$$

Obviously, the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)$ is independent of any quantum state $|a\rangle|x\rangle$ (as the initial input state) of the spin system $I_{n_i} S_n$. This suggests that the unitary operator can be applied not only to any pure quantum states of the spin system $I_{n_i} S_n$ but also directly to any mixed states of the spin ensemble $I_{n_i} S_n$ of the spin system [22, 23]. This is just the essence of the basic principle that both a closed quantum system and its ensemble obey the same unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics if there is not any decoherence effect in both the quantum system and its ensemble [22, 23, 24]. This principle forms the base of the current factoring algorithm and the real implementation of the algorithm on a spin ensemble. The unitary operator $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)$ hides the period r to be determined. In order to find the period it first needs to transfer the information of the period r of the unitary operator into quantum states of a quantum system or the density operator of its quantum ensemble because both the quantum states and density operators can be measured conveniently in practice. According to the basic principle the initial input state of the unitary operator $U_{I_k S_n}(y, r, N)$ can take either any pure quantum state of a closed quantum system or any mixed state, i.e., density operator of its ensemble, but in an NMR spin ensemble it is most convenient to take the initial density operator, i.e., the input state of the current factoring algorithm, as the thermal equilibrium state of the spin ensemble. For the spin ensemble $I_{n_i} S_n$ in a high magnetic field the thermal equilibrium state can be written as, in high temperature approximation

$$\rho_{eq} = \alpha E + \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kz} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{sk} S_{kz} \tag{20}$$

where E is the unity operator and the operators I_{kz} and S_{kz} are the longitudinal magnetization operators of the kth spins I and S, respectively. Then a nonselective 90°_y excitation pulse $R_i(90^\circ_y) = \exp(-i\pi I_y/2)$ applied to all the spins I and a 90°_φ nonselective pulse $R_s(90^\circ_{\pm y}) = \exp[\mp i(\pi/2)S_y]$ with two-step phase cycling $\varphi = +y, -y$ applied to all the spins S convert the thermal equilibrium state (20) into the single-quantum density operator,

$$\rho(0) = (\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes E_1^s \bigotimes E_2^s \bigotimes ... \bigotimes E_n^s \tag{21}$$

where the unity operator term αE is neglected without losing generality and E_k^s is the 4$-$dimensional unity operator of the kth spin S. The two-step phase cycling $\varphi = +y, -y$ [19, 20] cancels the contribution of the thermal equilibrium magnetization $\rho_{seq} = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{sk} S_{kz}$ of the subensemble S_n of the spin ensemble $I_{n_i} S_n$ to the output NMR signal, leaving only the thermal equilibrium magnetization $\rho_{ieq} = \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kz}$ of the subensemble I_{n_i} having a net contribution to the output NMR signal. Now the information of the period r in the unitary operator $U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)$ need to be loaded on the density operator of the spin ensemble $I_{n_i} S_n$. This can be achieved by applying the unitary operator on the initial density operator $\rho(0)$. An analytical calculation is important for the time evolution of the spin ensemble with the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ under the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)$. It can be performed conveniently by first expressing the initial density operator (21) in terms of the common eigenvectors of the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$ (1) and its Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ (2). By using the conventional computational basis set $\{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle,\ k = 0, 1, ..., r_{x_l} - 1;\ l = 0, 1, ..., t-1\}$ the initial density operator (21) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(0) = {} & (\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N| \\ & + (\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes \sum_{k_s=N}^{L-1} |k_s\rangle\langle k_s|, \quad (L = 2^n, \tfrac{1}{2}L < N < L).\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

With the help of the inverse Fourier transform of Eq.(12b) and the orthonormal relation (13b) the density operator $\rho(0)$ is further expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(0) = {} & (\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes \sum_{k=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_k}-1} |\Psi_s(x_k)\rangle\langle\Psi_s(x_k)| \\ & + (\sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes \sum_{k_s=N}^{L-1} |k_s\rangle\langle k_s|.\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

On the other hand, with the help of the definition (14) of the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_k S_n}(y,r,N)$ and its the Hamiltonian (15) as well as the eigenequation (4b) of the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ it is now easy to calculate the time evolution of the spin ensemble when applying the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ on the density operator $\rho(0)$ of Eq.(23),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho(m) = U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m \rho(0) U^{+}_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m \\
&= -\varepsilon_i I_y \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sin[2\pi ms/r_{x_l}] |\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle\langle\Psi_s(x_l)| \\
&+\varepsilon_i I_x \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \cos[2\pi ms/r_{x_l}] |\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle\langle\Psi_s(x_l)| \\
&+\varepsilon_i I_x \bigotimes \sum_{k_s=N}^{L-1} |k_s\rangle\langle k_s|, \qquad (24)
\end{aligned}$$

where all n_i spins I have the same spin polarization factor ε_i, that is, $\varepsilon_i I_\mu = \sum_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{k\mu}$ $(\mu = x,y,z)$. One can obtain the antisymmetric $y-$component of the density operator (24),

$$\rho_y(m) = -\varepsilon_i I_y \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sin[2\pi ms/r_{x_l}] |\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle\langle\Psi_s(x_l)|, \qquad (25)$$

by doing another experiment: $\rho(-m) = U^{+}_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m \rho(0) U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ and then coadding coherently the final output NMR signals of the two density operators $\rho(m)$ and $[-\rho(-m)]$, that is, $\rho_y(m) = \frac{1}{2}(\rho(m) - \rho(-m))$. The inverse unitary operation $U^{+}_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ can be also implemented efficiently just like the unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m$, as can be seen in next section. The density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(25) is antisymmetric for any integer m : $\rho_y(kr/2-m) = -\rho_y(kr/2+m)$, $k = 0,1,2,...$, because the period r can be divided by any dimensions r_{x_l}. By inserting the eigenstates $|\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle$ of Eq.(12a) into Eqs.(24) and (25) one can express the density operators $\rho(m)$ and $\rho_y(m)$ in terms of the conventional computational basis,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(m) = &-\varepsilon_i I_y \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} (\tfrac{1}{2i})\{-|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N| \\
&+|x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|\} \\
&+\varepsilon_i I_x \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} (\tfrac{1}{2})\{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N| \\
&+|x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|\} + \varepsilon_i I_x \bigotimes \sum_{k_s=N}^{L-1} |k_s\rangle\langle k_s| \qquad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\rho_y(m) = -\varepsilon_i I_y \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} (\tfrac{1}{2i})\{-|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N| \\ +|x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|\}. \tag{27}$$

Note that the conventional computational basis $\{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle, l = 0, 1, ..., t-1; k = 0, 1, ..., r_{x_l}-1\}$ of the subensemble S_n are orthogonal to each other, as shown in Eq.(13b). Then the operator $|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N|$ is a diagonal operator only when the equality $x_l y^k \bmod N = x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N$ holds. As shown in the previous section, the equality holds only when $m = k'r_{x_l}$ $(k' = 0, 1, ...,)$. Therefore, the operator $|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N|$ is an off-diagonal operator when $m \neq k'r_{x_l}$. It is known that the diagonal elements of a density operator are the noncoherence components which are known as the conventional longitudinal magnetization and spin order components in NMR spectroscopy, while the off-diagonal elements represent the coherent components of the density operator, and it is also well known in NMR spectroscopy that the coherent components of a density operator are the conventional multiple-quantum coherences including single-quantum coherence [19, 20]. It is shown below that the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(27) is a pure multiple-quantum coherence operator of the subensemble S_n. Here assume that the period r is an even integer. First, the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is clearly a pure multiple-quantum coherences when $m \neq k'r_{x_l}$. Next, it need to be shown that the integers $m = k'r_{x_l}$ are the zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$. The zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ are defined as those integers m satisfying $\rho_y(m) = 0$. Obviously, $m = k'r$ are the zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ because the period r can be divided by any dimensions r_{x_l} and hence $m = k'r = k_{x_l} r_{x_l}$ (k_{x_l} is an integer) which lead to the identity:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} [|x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N| \\ -|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N|] = 0, \ (l = 0, 1, ..., t-1), \tag{28}$$

and thus, the density operator $\rho_y(m) = 0$. Moveover, it is easy to prove that every integer $m = (2k' + 1)r/2$ satisfies the formula (28) and hence $m = (2k' + 1)r/2$ are also the zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$. Therefore, all possible zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ are given by $m = k'r/2$ $(k' = 0, 1, 2, ...)$. Then for any integer m the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is either an off-diagonal operator or equal to zero. This indicates that the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is a pure multiple-quantum coherence operator of the subensemble S_n and does not contain any longitudinal magnetization and spin order ($LOMSO$) operators of the spin subensemble.

The density operator $\rho(m)$ of Eq.(26) is more complicated and consists of both the $LOMSO$ operators and multiple-quantum coherence operators of the subensemble S_n. The first term on the right-hand side of Eq.(26) is really the pure multiple-quantum coherence operator $\rho_y(m)$, while the last term really consists of pure $LOMSO$ operators. These $LOMSO$ operators are really invariants under the unitary transformation in Eq.(24) with the unitary operator $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$. The second term contains the invariant diagonal element $\rho_{00} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ which keeps unchanged under the unitary transformation. When the integers $m = k'r$ the density operator of Eq.(26) equals the initial density operator: $\rho(m) = \varepsilon_i I_x = \rho(0)$, indicating that at the points $m = k'r$ the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ is not transferred into any multiple-quantum coherences of the subensemble S_n under the unitary transformation. Actually, if $m = k'r$ the unitary operator $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ is the unity operator, that is, $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m = E$, and any initial density operator keeps unchanged by the unity operation. One sees that at $m = k'r$ there is not any multiple-quantum coherence of the subensemble S_n in the density operator $\rho(m)$ and also in the density operator $\rho_y(m)$. Therefore, these integers $m = k'r$ $(k' = 0, 1, ...,)$ are really the zero points of the density operators $\rho(m)$ and $\rho_y(m)$ in the sense that there is not any multiple-quantum coherence of the subensemble S_n in these density operators, although $\rho(m) = \rho(0) \neq 0$ at $m = kr$. When $m = kr_{x_l}$ the whole conventional computational basis subset $S(x_l) = \{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle, k = 0, 1, ..., r_{x_l} - 1\}$ of the subensemble S_n keeps unchanged under the unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$, showing that the r_{x_l} operator terms $(\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes \sum\limits_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|$ of the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ of Eq.(22) can not be transferred into the multiple-quantum coherences. Based on these facts one can calculate the conversion efficiency of the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ into the multiple-quantum coherences under the unitary transformation.

It follows from Eq.(21) that the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ consists of L operator terms $\rho_{k_s} = (\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes |k_s\rangle\langle k_s|$, $k_s = 0, 1, ..., L-1$. That the density operator $\rho(0)$ can not be transferred completely into the multiple-quantum coherences of the subensemble S_n is because the $L - N$ operator terms $\sum\limits_{k_s=N}^{L-1} \rho_{k_s}$ $(N \geq L/2)$ and $\rho_{00} = (\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx})|0\rangle\langle 0|$ of the density operator $\rho(0)$ keeps unchanged under the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ with any integer m. But the total contribution of these invariant operator terms to the density operator $\rho(0)$ is clearly less than 50%. Therefore, when $m \neq kr_{x_l}$ $(l = 0, 1, ..., t-1)$ the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ is transferred into the multiple-quantum coherences in a high efficiency of 50% at least, and this efficiency is independent of the qubit number n of the spin ensemble $(I_{n_i}S_n)$. For the case $m = kr_{x_l}$ (each $r_{x_l} < r$) but $m \neq k'r$ the r_{x_l} operator terms $(\sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kx}) \bigotimes \sum\limits_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|$ also keep unchanged under the conditional unitary operation in addition to the $L - N$ operator terms $\sum\limits_{k_s=N}^{L-1} \rho_{k_s}$ and ρ_{00}, but the contribution from all these invariant operator terms to the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ is at most $(L - rd)/L$, as shown in the previous section. Then the conversion efficiency of the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ into the multiple-quantum coherences under the conditional unitary operation will be $rd/L = (N - p - q + 1)/L$ at least [14], as can be seen in the previous section. Note that $\frac{1}{2}L \leq N < L$. The efficiency rd/L is generally not less than 50% for a sufficient large number $N = pq$, indicating that for an arbitrary $m \neq kr$ the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ is efficiently transferred into the multiple-quantum coherences of the subensemble S_n in the density operator $\rho(m)$ with an efficiency generally not less than 50% under the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ on the spin ensemble $I_{n_i}S_n$ with a large qubit number n. This high conversion efficiency will directly result in that the multiple-quantum coherences of the subensemble S_n in the density operator $\rho(m)$ may be detected efficiently, as can be seen in next section.

4. NMR measurement of multiple-quantum coherences

Generally all the multiple-quantum coherences can not be observed directly in the NMR measurement except the single quantum coherence. All non-first-order multiple-quantum coherences usually may be detected indirectly through the direct NMR measurement of the single-quantum coherence. To detect multiple-quantum coherences one first needs to convert them into single-quantum coherence by making a unitary transformation composed of a sequence of RF pulses and interaction intervals in the spin ensemble. In general, the density operator of the spin ensemble, for example, $\rho(m)$, can be expanded as a quantum coherence order series [19],

$$\rho(m)=\sum_{p=-n}^{n}\sigma_p(m), \tag{29}$$

where the operator $\sigma_p(m)$ is the $p-$order quantum coherence operator and $\sigma_p(m)=\sigma_{-p}(m)^+$ because the density operator is an Hermitian operator. Since the present discussion is focused on the multiple-quantum coherences of the spin subensemble S_n of the spin ensemble $I_{n_i}S_n$ the order index p of the expansion series (29) in this special case is referred to the $p-$order quantum coherence of the spin subensemble S_n. The maximum quantum order of the subensemble S_n is n. This means that the density operator $\rho(m)$ (29) are generally composed of the multiple-quantum coherences with at most $2n+1$ different quantum orders range from $-n$ to n. The density operator $\rho(m)$ can be detected through the spins I or S by applying a unitary transformation to convert it into single quantum coherence. Here consider the measurement method through detecting the single quantum coherence of the spin I instead of the spin S. Before the multiple-quantum coherences are transferred into the single-quantum coherence of the spin I they are labelled with their own precession frequencies in order to distinguish different order quantum coherences, and in order to observe effectively the multiple-quantum spectral peaks of the multiple-quantum coherences one had better label all the same order quantum coherence with a single precession frequency. Then the spin Hamiltonian used to label the multiple-quantum coherences of the subensemble S_n may be chosen as

$$H_S=\sum_{k=1}^{n}\omega_{Sk}S_{kz}=\omega_S S_z. \tag{30}$$

This labelling Hamiltonian is independent of the spins I_{n_i}. Under this Hamiltonian the multiple-quantum spectrum of the spins S_n has at most $2n+1$ different order multiple-quantum peaks with their own precession frequencies, and the frequency for all $p-$order quantum coherence is simply equal to $p\omega_S$ $(p=-n,-n+1,...,n-1,n)$. The frequency labelling for the multiple-quantum coherences may be achieved by the time evolution process of the spin ensemble $(I_{n_i}S_n)$ starting at the density operator $\rho(m)$ under the Hamiltonian (30),

$$\rho(m,t_1)=\exp(-iH_St_1)\rho(m)\exp(iH_St_1)=\sum_{p=-n}^{n}\sigma_p(m)\exp(-ip\omega_St_1). \tag{31}$$

Then the density operator (31) is converted into single-quantum coherence under the specific unitary transformation $V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$ which may be constructed through the modular exponential operation $U(y,r,N)$,

$$\rho_f(m,t_1) = V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)\rho(m,t_1)V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^+. \tag{32}$$

Then the observable NMR signal for the density operator $\rho_f(m,t_1)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_f(m,t_1) &= Tr\{F\rho_f(m,t_1)\} \\ &= Tr\{V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^+ F V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)\rho_f(m,t_1)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where the observable single-quantum operator $F = I_x$, which is proportional to the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ (21). Because all the same order quantum coherence has the same precession frequency the total amplitude for a given order quantum NMR signal is the coherent sum of the amplitudes of all the same order quantum coherence. The unitary operator $V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$ should be constructed suitably in order that the coherent sum of the amplitudes is constructive and the inphase multiple-quantum spectrum is generated for all the same order quantum coherence, otherwise the total amplitude may severely attenuate due to the destructive coherent sum. One of the best ways to build up the unitary operator is simple to make the unitary operator satisfy [26],

$$V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N) = U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m. \tag{34}$$

This is a direct requirement of the famous time-reversal symmetry [27]. In high-resolution NMR spectroscopy the time-reversal symmetric unitary operator usually may not be easily created from the scalar J-coupling interactions of a complex coupled spin system in a liquid. An alternative method to generate the inphase multiple-quantum spectrum for all the same order quantum coherence may be that a series of experiments are performed starting from the same density operator, e.g., $\rho(m,t_1)$ of Eq.(31), and using different unitary operators $V^{(k)}_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$ so that the following relation is satisfied:

$$\sum_k V^{(k)}_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^+ F V^{(k)}_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N) = \varepsilon_i^{-1}\rho(m)^+ = \sum_{p=-n}^{n} \varepsilon_i^{-1}\sigma_p(m)^+, \tag{35}$$

then the inphase multiple-quantum spectra could be generated as well by adding coherently these experimental NMR signals, although the Hamiltonian of every unitary operator $V^{(k)}_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$ may not always satisfy the time-reversal symmetry [27]. The inphase multiple-quantum spectrum of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(25) may be generated by this method later.

According to number theory [28] Euclid′s algorithm may be used to find efficiently the multiplicative inverses in modular arithmetic. The inverse of the integer y modular N, i.e., $y^{-1} \bmod N$ can be efficiently calculated by Euclid′s algorithm by taking $O((\log_2 N)^3)$ steps [28]. Then according to the definition (1) of the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$ the inverse unitary operator

$U(y,r,N)^+$ then can be constructed by

$$U(y,r,N)^+ = U(y^{-1} \bmod N, r, N). \tag{36}$$

Then the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)^+$ can be efficiently constructed just as the unitary operator $U(y,r,N)$. Consequently the inverse conditional unitary operation $U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$ can be also constructed efficiently by the definition (14) of the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$. This directly leads to that the unitary operator $U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ can be efficiently constructed for any integer m because $U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m = U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y^m,r,N)$.

As an example, below the NMR multiple-quantum signal $S_f(m,t_1)$ of Eq.(33) is calculated in detailed using the unitary operator $V_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)$ of Eq.(34). There are the orthogonal relations between different order multiple-quantum coherence operators,

$$Tr\{\sigma_p(m)^+\sigma_{p'}(m)\} = Tr\{|\sigma_p(m)|^2\}\delta_{pp'}. \tag{37}$$

Inserting Eq.(31) and (34) into Eq.(33) and using the orthogonal relations (37) one can further write the NMR signal (33) as

$$S_f(m,t_1) = \sum_{p=-n}^{n} \varepsilon_i^{-1} Tr\{|\sigma_p(m)|^2\} \exp(-ip\omega_S t_1). \tag{38}$$

The multiple-quantum spectrum $S_f(m,\omega - p\omega_S)$ can be obtained by fast Fourier transforming (t_1) the time-domain NMR signal $S_f(m,t_1)$ of Eq.(38). Then the $p-$order quantum peak in the multiple-quantum spectrum has an intensity $I(p,m) = \varepsilon_i^{-1} Tr\{|\sigma_p(m)|^2\}$ and the total intensity for the multiple-quantum spectrum is given by

$$I(m) = \sum_{p=-n}^{n} \varepsilon_i^{-1} Tr\{|\sigma_p(m)|^2\}. \tag{39}$$

The expansion (29) and the orthogonal relations (37) show that the total intensity $I(m)$ also can be expressed as

$$I(m) = \varepsilon_i^{-1} Tr\{\rho(m)^+\rho(m)\}. \tag{40}$$

The formula (39) and (40) are really the direct result of equation.(35), a general method to obtain inphase multiple-quantum spectra. The total spectral power $I(t)$ of the density operator $\rho(t) = U(t)\rho(0)U(t)^+$ including the contributions from both the multiple-quantum coherence and the $LOMSO$ operator components actually keeps unchanged when an arbitrary unitary operation $U(t)$ is applied to the initial density operator $\rho(0)$,

$$I(t) = \varepsilon^{-1} Tr\{|\rho(t)|^2\} = \varepsilon^{-1} Tr\{|\rho(0)|^2\}. \tag{41}$$

This property could be helpful for conveniently manipulating the modular exponential operation. Inserting all the multiple-quantum coherence components of the density operator $\rho(m)$ of Eq.(26) into (40) the total intensity

$I(m)$ can be calculated explicitly using the orthogonal relations (13a) and $Tr\{I_{x,y}^2\} = \frac{1}{4}n_i 2^{n_i}$ (the trace is only in the subensemble I_{n_i}),

$$I(m) = \tfrac{1}{4}n_i 2^{n_i}\varepsilon_i\{N - \sum_{j=0}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} r_{x_k}\delta(m, jr_{x_k})\}, \tag{42}$$

where the delta function $\delta(x,y) = \delta_{xy}$. The second term of Eq.(42) accounts for those invariant diagonal operators $\{|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|\}$ under the conditional unitary operation in Eq.(24) which have not a net contribution to the multiple-quantum spectrum. The total intensity $I(m)$ satisfies, as shown in previous section,

$I(m) = 0$ if $m = 0, r, 2r, ...,$

$I(m) \geq \frac{1}{4}n_i 2^{n_i}\varepsilon_i[N - (p+q-1)]$ if $m \neq 0, r, 2r, ...$

If one detects only the multiple-quantum coherences of the antisymmetric density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(25) then the total intensity $I_y(m)$ of the multiple-quantum spectrum of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ can be derived as

$$I_y(m) = \varepsilon_i^{-1}Tr\{\rho_y(m)^+\rho_y(m)\}. \tag{43}$$

Since the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is a pure multiple-quantum coherence operator one can calculate the total intensity $I_y(m)$ directly by inserting the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(25) into Eq.(43),

$$\begin{aligned} I_y(m) &= \varepsilon_i^{-1}Tr\{|\varepsilon_i I_y \bigotimes \sum_{k=0}^{t-1}\sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_k}-1} \sin[2\pi ms/r_{x_k}]|\Psi_s(x_k)\rangle\langle\Psi_s(x_k)||^2\} \\ &= \tfrac{1}{8}n_i 2^{n_i}\varepsilon_i[N - \sum_{j=0}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} r_{x_k}\delta(2m, jr_{x_k})], \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where the orthogonal relations (13a) of the eigenvectors $|\Psi_s(x_k)\rangle$ and the relations below has been used,

$$\sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_k}-1}\exp(\pm i4\pi ms/r_{x_k}) = r_{x_k}\delta(2m, jr_{x_k}), j = 0, 1, 2, ... \tag{45}$$

As can be seen in previous section, each r_{x_k} can divide the period r and the total number of the computational basis of those basis sets $S(x_k)$ with the periods $r_{x_k} < r$ is $(p+q-1)$ at most including the state $|0\rangle$ [14], that is, for any given integer m, $(p+q-1) \geq \sum_{j=0}\sum_{k=0}^{t-1} r_{x_k}\delta(2m, jr_{x_k})$ with the sum for index k running only over all $r_{x_k} < r$, and most of the computational basis $(\geq N - (p+q-1))$ belong to those subsets with the period r. Therefore, the total intensity $I_y(m)$ satisfies,

$I_y(m) = 0$ if $m = 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...,$

$I_y(m) \geq \frac{1}{8}n_i 2^{n_i}\varepsilon_i[N - (p+q-1)]$ if $m \neq 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...$

Here suppose that the period r is an even integer, otherwise $r/2, 3r/2, ...$, are not integers and hence not zero points and the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ has only zero points with integer $m = 0, r, 2r, ...$

If the initial thermal equilibrium density operator of Eq.(20) now is transferred completely into the observable single quantum coherence, then the generated NMR spectrum will have a total intensity $I_0 = \varepsilon_i Tr\{I_z^2\} + \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n} \varepsilon_{sk} Tr\{S_{kz}^2\} = \frac{1}{4} 2^{(n+n_i)}(n_i\varepsilon_i + n\varepsilon_s)$. The conversion efficiency from the thermal equilibrium state of Eq.(20) into the multiple-quantum coherences of the density operators $\rho(m)$ and $\rho_y(m)$ under the conditional unitary operation in Eq.(24) are given by the ratios $I_y(m)/I_0$ and $I_y(m)/I_0$, respectively, which satisfy,

$I(m)/I_0 = 0$ if $m = 0, r, 2r, ...,$

$I(m)/I_0 > n_i\varepsilon_i[N - (p + q - 1)]/[2^n(n_i\varepsilon_i + n\varepsilon_s)]$ if $m \neq 0, r, 2r, ...$

and

$I_y(m)/I_0 = 0$ if $m = 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...,$

$I_y(m)/I_0 > \frac{1}{2} n_i\varepsilon_i[N - (p+q-1)]/[2^n(n_i\varepsilon_i + n\varepsilon_s)]$ if $m \neq 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...$

In fact, the multiple-quantum coherences of $\rho(m)$ (26) and $\rho_y(m)$ (27) are generated only from the thermal equilibrium state $\rho_{ieq} = \sum\limits_{k=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_{ik} I_{kz}$ of the spins I_{n_i} (which is completely transferred into $\rho(0)$ (22)), while the thermal equilibrium state magnetization (ρ_{seq}) of the spins S_n of the initial thermal equilibrium state ρ_{eq} (20) has not a net contribution to the multiple-quantum coherences. The total intensity for the multiple-quantum spectrum generated from the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ (22) should be $I_{i0} = \varepsilon_i Tr\{I_z^2\} = \frac{1}{4} n_i\varepsilon_i 2^{(n+n_i)}$. Therefore, the conversion efficiency for the initial density operator (22) into the multiple-quantum coherences $\rho_y(m)$ should be measured more exactly by the ratio $I_y(m)/I_{i0}$ instead of the ratio $I_y(m)/I_0$. The ratio $I_y(m)/I_{i0}$ satisfies,

$I_y(m)/I_{i0} = 0$, $m = 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...,$

$I_y(m)/I_{i0} \geq \frac{1}{2}[N - (p + q - 1)]/2^n$, $m \neq 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...$

It can be seen that the efficiency is almost independent of the qubit number n of the spin ensemble $(I_{n_i}S_n)$ for a large prime integer $N = pq$ $(2^{n-1} \leq N < 2^n)$. Therefore, for a large prime integer N and $m \neq 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...$ the initial thermal equilibrium density operator ρ_{ieq} is efficiently transferred into the multiple-quantum coherences $\rho_y(m)$ with an efficiency more than 1/4. Since there are $2n+1$ peaks in the multiple-quantum spectrum of $\rho_y(m)$ the intensity for each peak of the $2n+1$ peaks, on average, is approximately inversely proportional to the qubit number n, indicating that intensities for some of the $2n+1$ multiple-quantum peaks do not reduce exponentially as the qubit number n.

The density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(27) is a pure multiple-quantum coherences of the spin subensemble S_n, but $\rho(m)$ contains both the multiple-quantum coherence and the $LOMSO$ operators. The $LOMSO$ components may hamper the detection of zero-quantum coherence in the multiple-quantum spectra since both have zero frequency in the multiple-quantum spectra under the frequency labelling Hamiltonian (30). A better method may be using only the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ and its intensity $I_y(m)$ to solve the factoring problem. According to the scheme (35) to create inphase multiple-quantum spectra the pulse sequence to create the output NMR signal with the intensity $I_y(m)$ (43) consists of the two experiments:

$$\rho_f(m,t_1)=U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y^m,r,N)\exp(-iH_St_1)\rho_y(m)\exp(iH_St_1)U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y^m,r,N),$$

$$\rho_f(m,t_1)=U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y^m,r,N)R_i(180^\circ_x)\exp(-iH_St_1)$$
$$\times\rho_y(m)\exp(iH_St_1)R_i(180^\circ_x)^+U^+_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y^m,r,N).$$

By adding coherently the output NMR signals of the two experiments one will obtain the desired NMR signal with the intensity $I_y(m)$ (43). Since the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is obtained from the two experiments, as shown in previous section, the complete pulse sequence to create the intensity $I_y(m)$ consists of four experiments.

A more general initial density operator $\rho(0)$ is suggested below for the modular exponential operation sequence above. For convenient treatment, the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ still has a general $LOMSO$ operator $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ of the subensemble S_n, that is,

$$\rho(0)=\alpha E+\sum_{j=1}\rho_{I_{n_i}}(0)_j\bigotimes\rho_{S_n}(0)_j. \tag{46}$$

The two components $\rho_{I_{n_i}}(0)$ and $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ of the density operator $\rho(0)$ belong to the two subensembles I_{n_i} and S_n of the spin ensemble $I_{n_i}S_n$, respectively. Particularly, in previous factoring sequence the density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ is the unity operator E, as can be seen in the initial density operator of Eq.(21). The initial density operator can be prepared properly from the thermal equilibrium state (20) of the spin ensemble $I_{n_i}S_n$ by a suitable pulse sequence. Ignoring the unity operator term αE the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ (46) is generally written as

$$\rho(0)=\sum_{j=1}^{n_1}\varepsilon_jI_{jx}\bigotimes\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1}\rho_j(x_ly^k\bmod N)|x_ly^k\bmod N\rangle\langle x_ly^k\bmod N|$$

$$+\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j I_{jx} \bigotimes \sum_{k=N}^{L-1} \rho_j(k)|k\rangle\langle k|, \quad (L = 2^n,\ \tfrac{1}{2}L < N < L). \tag{47}$$

where the coefficient $\rho_j(x_l y^k \bmod N)$ is the diagonal element with the index $(x_l y^k \bmod N)$ of the initial density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)_j$. There are the unitary transformations according the definition (14) of the conditional modular exponential operation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&U_{I_k S_n}(y,r,N)^m I_{jx} \bigotimes |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N| U^+_{I_k S_n}(y,r,N)^m \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2}(|1\rangle\langle 0|)_k \bigotimes |x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N| \\
&+\tfrac{1}{2}(|0\rangle\langle 1|)_k \bigotimes |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N|, \text{ if } j = k; \qquad (48a) \\
&= (|1\rangle\langle 1|)_k \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes |x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N| \\
&+(|0\rangle\langle 0|)_k \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|, \text{ if } j \neq k. \qquad (48b)
\end{aligned}$$

The unitary transformations (48a) and (48b) show that the diagonal operator $|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|$ of the subensemble S_n can not be converted into multiple-quantum coherences but into other *LOMSO* operators by the conditional modular exponential operation $U_{I_k S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ $(k \neq j)$ which Hamiltonian (15) does not contain the operator I_{jz}. The unitary transformations can be used further to calculate the time evolution of the spin ensemble with the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ (47) under the conditional modular exponential operation (18),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho(m) = U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y,r,N)^m \rho(0) U^+_{I_k S_n}(y,r,N)^m \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n_1}\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \varepsilon_j \rho_j(x_l y^k \bmod N) U_{I_j S_n}(y,r,N)^m \\
&\times\{(E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \\
&\bigotimes |x_l y^{k+m(n_i-1)} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m(n_i-1)} \bmod N| \\
&+[(E_{00})_1 \bigotimes (E_{11})_2 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \\
&+(E_{11})_1 \bigotimes (E_{00})_2 \bigotimes (E_{11})_3 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \\
&\bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} + ... + (E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \\
&\bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i-1} \bigotimes (E_{00})_{n_i}] \bigotimes |x_l y^{k+m(n_i-2)} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m(n_i-2)} \bmod N| \\
&+[(E_{00})_1 \bigotimes (E_{00})_2 \bigotimes (E_{11})_3 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \\
&\bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} + ... + (E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i-2} \\
&\bigotimes (E_{00})_{n_i-1} \bigotimes (E_{00})_{n_i}] \bigotimes |x_l y^{k+m(n_i-3)} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m(n_i-3)} \bmod N| \\
&+ ... + (E_{00})_1 \bigotimes (E_{00})_2 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{00})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{00})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{00})_{n_i} \\
&\bigotimes |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|\} U^+_{I_j S_n}(y,r,N)^m \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j I_{jx} \bigotimes \sum_{k=N}^{L-1} \rho_j(k)|k\rangle\langle k|, \qquad (49)
\end{aligned}$$

where the operator $E_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j|$ and the $2 \times 2-$dimensional unity operator of the kth spin I is expressed as $E_k^i = (E_{00})_k + (E_{11})_k$. The density operator $\rho(m)$ (49) can be simplified by using the shift-invariance identity:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \rho_j(x_l y^k \bmod N)|x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N| \\
=&\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \rho_j(x_l y^{(k-qm) \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N)|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N|, \qquad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

where $0 \leq (k-qm) \bmod r_{x_l} < r_{x_l}$ for any integers q and m. For example, one of those operator terms in the density operator $\rho(m)$ (49) is calculated in detailed below,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho^q(m) = U_{I_j S_n}(y,r,N)^m (E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \\
&\bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \varepsilon_j \rho_j(x_l y^k \bmod N) \\
&\times |x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N| U^{+}_{I_j S_n}(y,r,N)^m \\
&= \tfrac{1}{2}(E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes (|1\rangle\langle 0|)_j \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \\
&\bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \varepsilon_j \rho_j(x_l y^{[k-qm] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N)|x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^k \bmod N| \\
&+\tfrac{1}{2}(E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes (|0\rangle\langle 1|)_j \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \\
&\bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \varepsilon_j \rho_j(x_l y^{[k-qm] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N) \\
&\times |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N|, \ (q = n_i - 1). \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

One then further calculates the contribution of the operator term (51) to the total intensity $I(m)$ of the multiple-quantum spectrum of the subensemble S_n of the density operator $\rho(m)$ (49). When $m \neq k' r_{x_l}$, $(k' = 0,1,...; l = 0,1,...,t-1)$, the contribution is given by

$$2\varepsilon_i \sum_{l=1}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} |\tfrac{1}{2}\rho_j(x_l y^{[k-qm] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N)|^2 = \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2.$$

where the diagonal operator term $\rho_{00} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ is not included. When $m = k'r$ the contribution is nothing to the multiple-quantum spectrum, that is, the integers $m = k'r$ are the zero points of the multiple-quantum spectrum. When $m = k' r_{x_l}$ but $m \neq k'r$ the contribution of the term (51) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
&2\varepsilon_i \sum_{l=1}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} |\tfrac{1}{2}\rho_j(x_l y^{[k-qm] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N)|^2 \\
&\qquad \geq \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon_i \{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2 - (p+q-1)|\rho_j(k)^2|_{\max}\}
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\rho_j(k)|_{\max}$ is the maximum diagonal element of the initial density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)_j$. Now the total intensity $I(m)$ of the multiple-quantum spectrum can be calculated from the density operator (49) using the orthogonal relations between any pair of operator terms including the operator term (51) in the density operator $\rho(m)$ (49). When $m \neq k' r_{x_l}$, the total intensity $I(m)$ is given by

$$I(m) = \tfrac{1}{2} 2^{n_i - 1} \varepsilon_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2.$$

When $m = k'r$ the total intensity is zero, that is,

$$I(m) = 0 \text{ if } m = 0, r, 2r, ...,$$

indicating that the integers $m = k'r$ are the zero points of the multiple-quantum spectrum. When $m = k' r_{x_l}$ but $m \neq k'r$ the total intensity $I(m)$ satisfies

$$I(m) \geq \tfrac{1}{2} 2^{n_i - 1} \varepsilon_i \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \{ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2 - (p + q - 1) |\rho_j(k)^2|_{\max} \}.$$

Obviously, the initial density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)_j$ of the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ (47) can be efficiently transferred into the multiple-quantum coherences under the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ with any integer m except the zero points $m = k'r$ when the density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)_j$ satisfies,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2 >> (p + q - 1) |\rho_j(k)^2|_{\max}. \tag{52a}$$

and

$$\{ \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2 \}^{-1} \{ \sum_{k=0}^{L-1} \rho_j(k)^2 \} \sim poly(n) \tag{52b}$$

Using the auxiliary experiment $\rho(-m) = U^{+}_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)^m \rho(0) U_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ one can separate the antisymmetric part $\rho_y(m)$ ($\rho_y(m) = \frac{1}{2}\rho(m) - \frac{1}{2}\rho(-m)$) from the density operator $\rho(m)$ (49). The density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is a pure multiple-quantum coherence operator. For example, the operator term (51) contains a component of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\rho_y^q(m) = \tfrac{1}{4}(E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jx} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \\
&\bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \varepsilon_j [\rho_j(x_l y^{[k-qm] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N) - \rho_j(x_l y^{[k+qm+m] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N)] \\
&\times \{ |x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^k \bmod N| + |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N| \} \\
&+ \tfrac{1}{4}(E_{11})_1 \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j-1} \bigotimes I_{jy} \bigotimes (E_{11})_{j+1} \bigotimes ... \bigotimes (E_{11})_{n_i} \\
&\bigotimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \varepsilon_j [\rho_j(x_l y^{[k-qm] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N) \\
&+ \rho_j(x_l y^{[k+qm+m] \bmod r_{x_l}} \bmod N)] \{ i |x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N| \\
&- i |x_l y^{k+m} \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^k \bmod N| \}, \ (q = n_i - 1).
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

One sees that the zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ are $m = k'r/2$, that is, $\rho_y(k'r/2) = 0$. When $m \neq k'r_{x_l}/2$, it is easy to calculate the contribution of the operator term $\rho_y^q(m)$ (53) to the total intensity $I_y(m)$ of the multiple-quantum spectrum of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$,

$$I_y^q(m) = Tr\{|\rho_y^q(m)|^2\} = \tfrac{1}{4}\varepsilon_i \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2.$$

When $m = k'r_{x_l}/2$ but $m \neq k'r/2$ the contribution of the operator term (53) satisfies, $I_y^q(m) \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_i\{\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2 - (p+q-1)|\rho_j(k)^2|_{\max}\}$. The total intensity $I_y(m)$ then can be calculated through the density operator $\rho_y(m)$. It is easy to prove that the intensity $I_y(m)$ satisfies,

$I_y(m) = 0$ if $m = 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...;$

$I_y(m) \geq \frac{1}{4}\varepsilon_i 2^{n_i - 1}\{\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \rho_j(k)^2 - (p+q-1)|\rho_j(k)^2|_{\max}\}$ if $m \neq 0, r/2, r, 3r/2, ...$

Therefore, the pure multiple-quantum coherences of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ are efficiently created by the conditional modular exponential operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ with any integer m except the zero points $m = k'r/2$ when the initial density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)_j$ satisfies the conditions (52a) and (52b).

In order to calculate analytically the multiple-quantum spectrum of the density operators $\rho(m)$ and $\rho_y(m)$ a compact and analytical derivation for the density operators is given below. With the help of the Fourier transform (12b) and the Hermitian property of the density operator the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ (47) can be written in a symmetrical form

$$\rho(0) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j I_{jx} \otimes \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sum_{s'=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \tfrac{1}{2}\{\rho_j(s-s', x_l)|\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle\langle\Psi_{s'}(x_l)|$$
$$+\rho_j(s'-s, x_l)|\Psi_{s'}(x_l)\rangle\langle\Psi_s(x_l)|\} + \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j I_{jx} \otimes \sum_{k=N}^{L-1} \rho_j(k)|k\rangle\langle k| \qquad (54)$$

where the coefficient $\rho_j(s - s', x_l)$ is given by

$$\rho_j(s-s', x_l) = \tfrac{1}{r_{x_l}} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \rho_j(x_l y^k \operatorname{mod} N) \exp[-i2\pi k(s-s')/r_{x_l}]. \qquad (55)$$

Now the time evolution of the spin ensemble is calculated with the aid of the Hamiltonian of Eq.(15) and the eigen-equation (4a) when acting the conditional unitary operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ on the density operator $\rho(0)$ of Eq.(54),

$$\rho(m) = U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y, r, N)^m \rho(0) U_{I_{n_i}S_n}^+(y, r, N)^m$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sum_{s'=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \exp[-i\pi n_i m(s-s')/r_{x_l}] \exp[i2\pi m(s-s')/r_{x_l} I_z] \\
&\times \{ \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j \rho_j(s-s', x_l)(I_{jx} \cos[2\pi m s'/r_{x_l}] - I_{jy} \sin[2\pi m s'/r_{x_l}]) \} \\
&\bigotimes |\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle \langle \Psi_{s'}(x_l)| + \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sum_{s'=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \exp[-i\pi n_i m(s'-s)/r_{x_l}] \\
&\times \{ \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j \rho_j(s'-s, x_l)(I_{jx} \cos[2\pi m s'/r_{x_l}] - I_{jy} \sin[2\pi m s'/r_{x_l}]) \} \\
&\times \exp[i2\pi m(s'-s)/r_{x_l} I_z] \bigotimes |\Psi_{s'}(x_l)\rangle \langle \Psi_s(x_l)| \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \varepsilon_j I_{jx} \bigotimes \sum_{k=N}^{L-1} \rho_j(k) |k\rangle \langle k|.
\end{aligned} \tag{56}
$$

The unitary diagonal operator $\exp[i2\pi m(s-s')/r_{x_l} I_z]$ can be expanded in the $LOMSO$ subspace [29] of the subensemble I_{n_i},

$$\exp[i2\pi m(s-s')/r_{x_l} I_z] = \alpha_0 F_0 + \alpha_1 F_1 + \alpha_2 F_2 + ... + \alpha_{n_i} F_{n_i} \tag{57}$$

where the operator F_k is the full symmetrical $k-$body interaction basis operator of the $LOMSO$ subspace [21, 29],

$$F_0 = E,\ F_1 = I_z,\ F_2 = \sum_{l>k=1}^{n_i} 2 I_{kz} I_{lz},\ F_3 = \sum_{m>l>k=1}^{n_i} 4 I_{kz} I_{lz} I_{mz}, ...,$$

$$F_{n_i} = 2^{n_i - 1} I_{1z} I_{2z} ... I_{n_i z},$$

and the coefficient α_p is generally expressed as

$$\alpha_p = \sum_{q=0}^{n_i} c_{pq} \exp[i2\pi m(s-s')/r_{x_l}(n_i/2-q)], \tag{58}$$

where the real coefficient c_{pq} can be determined using the method in Ref.[29]. By inserting Eqs.(55), (57), and (58) into Eq.(56) and then using the Fourier transform (12a) and dividing the $LOMSO$ operator F_p into two parts: $F_p = F_{1p}^j + 2I_{jz} F_{2p}^j$ the density operator $\rho(m)$ can be expressed in terms of the conventional computational basis,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho(m) &= -\tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sum_{p,q=0}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{pq} \varepsilon_j I_{jy} Q_1(j, p, x_l, k, m) \\
&\bigotimes (\tfrac{1}{2i}) \{ +|x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^{k+qm+m} \bmod N| \\
&\quad -|x_l y^{k+qm+m} \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N| \} \\
&+ \tfrac{1}{2} \sum_{l=0}^{t-1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1} \sum_{p,q=0}^{n_1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{pq} \varepsilon_j I_{jx} Q_1(j, p, x_l, k, m) \\
&\bigotimes (\tfrac{1}{2}) \{ +|x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^{k+qm+m} \bmod N| \\
&\quad +|x_l y^{k+qm+m} \bmod N\rangle \langle x_l y^{k+qm} \bmod N| \}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$+\sum_{j=1}^{n_1}\varepsilon_j I_{jx}\bigotimes\sum_{k=N}^{L-1}\rho_j(k)|k\rangle\langle k|, \tag{59}$$

where the operator function $Q_1(j,p,x_l,k,m)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}Q_1(j,p,x_l,k,m) = {} & F_{1p}^j[\rho_j(x_l y^k \operatorname{mod} N)+\rho_j(x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N)] \\ & +F_{2p}^j[\rho_j(x_l y^k \operatorname{mod} N)-\rho_j(x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N)]\end{aligned}$$

Using the auxiliary experiment $\rho(-m)=U_{I_{n_i}S_n}^{+}(y,r,N)^m\rho(0)U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y,r,N)^m$ one can further separate the antisymmetric part $\rho_y(m)$ from the density operator $\rho(m)$, $(\rho_y(m)=\frac{1}{2}\rho(m)-\frac{1}{2}\rho(-m))$,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_y(m) = {} & -\tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1}\sum_{p,q=0}^{n_1}\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{pq}\varepsilon_j I_{jy} Q_1(j,p,x_l,k,m) \\ & \bigotimes(\tfrac{1}{2i})\{+|x_l y^{k+qm} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+qm+m} \operatorname{mod} N| \\ & \quad -|x_l y^{k+qm+m} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+qm} \operatorname{mod} N|\} \\ & -\tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1}\sum_{p,q=0}^{n_1}\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{pq}\varepsilon_j I_{jy} Q_2(j,p,x_l,k+qm,m) \\ & \bigotimes(\tfrac{1}{2i})\{+|x_l y^{k} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N| \\ & \quad -|x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k} \operatorname{mod} N|\} \\ & +\tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1}\sum_{p,q=0}^{n_1}\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{pq}\varepsilon_j I_{jx} Q_1(j,p,x_l,k,m) \\ & \bigotimes(\tfrac{1}{2})\{+|x_l y^{k+qm} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+qm+m} \operatorname{mod} N| \\ & \quad +|x_l y^{k+qm+m} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+qm} \operatorname{mod} N|\} \\ & -\tfrac{1}{4}\sum_{l=0}^{t-1}\sum_{k=0}^{r_{x_l}-1}\sum_{p,q=0}^{n_1}\sum_{j=1}^{n_1} c_{pq}\varepsilon_j I_{jx} Q_2(j,p,x_l,k+qm,m) \\ & \bigotimes(\tfrac{1}{2})\{+|x_l y^{k} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N| \\ & \quad +|x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N\rangle\langle x_l y^{k} \operatorname{mod} N|\}\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where the operator function $Q_2(j,p,x_l,k,m)$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}Q_2(j,p,x_l,k,m) = {} & F_{1p}^j[\rho_j(x_l y^k \operatorname{mod} N)+\rho_j(x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N)] \\ & -F_{2p}^j[\rho_j(x_l y^k \operatorname{mod} N)-\rho_j(x_l y^{k+m} \operatorname{mod} N)]\end{aligned}$$

Obviously, the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ is antisymmetric, that is, $\rho_y(kr/2+m)=-\rho_y(kr/2-m)$ $(k=0,1,...)$, and it is a pure multiple-quantum coherence operator of the subensemble S_n. The antisymmetric property might be helpful for speeding up the searching for the zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$.

5. Searching for the period of modular exponential function

In previous sections it has been shown that the modular exponential operation can be performed easily on an NMR quantum computer just like on a classical digital computer. The classical computer outputs the value of the modular exponential function $f(y, m, N) = y^m \bmod N$ given the input integers y, m, and N, while the NMR quantum computer outputs the multiple-quantum spectrum of the spin ensemble which intensity does not reduce exponentially as the qubit number of the spin ensemble. Both the classical and quantum computations of the modular exponential function have the same computational complexity. In classical computation the values of the modular exponential function with different inputs, i.e., the integer m, are generally independent on each other. Therefore it is a hard problem to find the period r of the modular exponential function on a classical computer. However, the essential difference for the quantum computer from the classical one is that the computational process on the quantum computer obeys the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics. Then in the factoring problem the quantum computational process and output (through the density operator) are governed by the Liouville-von Neumann equation or the Schrödinger equation where the integer m acts as the discrete time variable, as can be seen below, and therefore the output results at different times (m) really correlate to each other. This essential point could form the base to solve efficiently the factoring problem and play a key important role for the quantum computer outperforming the classical one in solving the factoring problem.

In general, the amplitudes and phases of multiple-quantum coherences of $\rho(m)$ and $\rho_y(m)$ with different quantum orders are dependent on the integer m in the spin ensemble, which are described by the Liouville-von Neumann equation. In particular, the amplitude and phase for the long-range-interaction and higher-order multiple-quantum coherences could be helpful for efficiently searching for the period r. The Liouville-von Neumann equation with Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ that governs the unitary dynamical process during the modular exponential operation (1) in a spin ensemble can be written as

$$d\rho(t)/dt = -i[H(y, r, N), \rho(t)],\ (\hbar = 1). \tag{61}$$

The solution to the Liouville equation then is given formally by

$$\rho(t) = U(t)\rho(0)U(t)^{+} \tag{62}$$

where the propagator is written as

$$U(t) = \exp[-itH(y, r, N)]. \tag{63}$$

By comparing the unitary operator $U(t)$ with the modular exponential operator $U(y,r,N)^m$ of Eq.(7) one sees that the integer m in the modular exponential operator is really equivalent to the time variable t and their difference is merely that the time variable t is continuous but the integer m discrete. Therefore, the propagator is time periodic: $U(t) = U(t+r)$, where the period r needs to be determined in the factoring problem. Below it is assumed that the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ consists of a dominating and a relative small operator components,

$$H(y,r,N) = H_0 + H_1. \tag{64}$$

The dominating term H_0 is a specific order quantum operator, for example, a zero-quantum coherence operator, while the small operator term H_1 is usually a multiple-quantum operator. By making the coordinate frame transformation: $\rho_r(t) = \exp(iH_0t)\rho(t)\exp(-iH_0t)$, here the frame is called the interaction frame defined by the Hamiltonian H_0, the Liouville equation (61) is rewritten as

$$d\rho_r(t)/dt = -i[\hat{H}_1(t), \rho_r(t)], \tag{65}$$

with the time-dependent Hamiltonian in the interaction frame:

$$\hat{H}_1(t) = \exp(iH_0t)H_1\exp(-iH_0t). \tag{66}$$

The solution to the Liouville equation (66) is given in form

$$\rho_r(t) = U_1(t,t_0)\rho(t_0)U_1(t,t_0)^+ \tag{67}$$

with the propagator in the interaction frame:

$$U_1(t,t_0) = T\exp(-i\int_{t_0}^{t}\hat{H}_1(t')dt'), \tag{68}$$

where the operator T is Dyson time-ordering operator. To see more clearly the time evolution process in the interaction frame the solution of Eq.(67) is expanded,

$$\rho(t) = \exp(-iH_0t)\{\rho(0) - it[\hat{H}_1(t), \rho(0)] \\ -\tfrac{1}{2}t^2[\hat{H}_1(t), [\hat{H}_1(t), \rho(0)]] + ...\}\exp(iH_0t). \tag{69}$$

Suppose that the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ is a $LOMSO$ operator, for example, the initial density operator component $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ of Eq.(46) that is a $LOMSO$ operator of the subensemble S_n. It can be seen clearly from the expansion (69) how the initial density operator is converted into multiple-quantum coherences as time development. Since the zero-quantum Hamiltonian H_0 is dominating the initial $LOMSO$ density operator is converted efficiently into the zero-quantum coherence at a short time, e.g., $t = 1$ $(m = 1)$. In general, the $p-$order quantum peak is strongest at a short time (a small m) if the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ contains a dominating $p-$order quantum coherence operator. This ensures that the NMR multiple-quantum signals at the time points $t=0$ and $t=1$ can be precisely distinguished experimentally without an exponential resource by the multiple-quantum spectroscopic method. The measurement precision is important on a quantum computer, while it is not any problem in a classical computer. Since the multiple-quantum Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_1(t)$ is small the nonzero-order multiple-quantum coherences will grow slowly and monotonously in a long time interval. At the same time the zero-quantum coherence first increases quickly and reaches its maximum and then decreases gradually as time development because part of the initial density operator is converted into the multiple-quantum coherences. The same time evolution behavior of the density operator $\rho(t)$ near the zero point $\rho(0)$ also occurs at other zero points $\rho(kr)$ $(k=0,1,...)$ due to the period of the density operator, $\rho(kr)=\rho(0)$. If such time development behavior for the zero-quantum and nonzero-order quantum coherences continues in a time interval ΔT satisfying $r/\Delta T \sim poly(n)$ then the searching for the zero points of the multiple-quantum spectra will be polynomial-time on the NMR quantum computer. The searching efficiency is proportional to the time interval ΔT, that is, the longer the time interval ΔT the higher the efficiency. The searching efficiency will decrease if the density operator $\rho(t)$ arrives at its steady state at a shorter time. Here the steady state implies that the intensity $I_y(p,t)$ for any $p-$order quantum coherence does not change as the time. The situation may occur when the multiple-quantum Hamiltonian H_1 is not small, however, even in this case the searching is still efficient if the initial integer m is sufficiently near the zero points. Obviously, the searching for the zero points is locally efficient in a small region near the zero points. The steady-state problem is harmful for the present factoring algorithm to find efficiently the zero points in a spin ensemble and needs to be overcome. It is closely related to the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ and the distribution of different order quantum transitions in a spin ensemble. It is possible to overcome the steady-state problem by manipulating the Hamiltonian $H(y,r,N)$ and choosing the proper initial density operator in the factoring sequence.

The distribution of different order quantum transitions for a spin ensemble with n non-equivalent spins-1/2 has been found [19]. The number of the zero-quantum transitions is $Z_0=\frac{1}{2}\{\left(\begin{array}{c}2n\\ n\end{array}\right)-2^n\}$ and for $p-$order quantum transitions $Z_p=\left(\begin{array}{c}2n\\ n-p\end{array}\right)$, $p=1,2,...,n$. In the case of the large n and relative small $p\neq 0$ the $p-$order quantum transition number can be approximated by Stirling formulae, $Z_p=4^n(\pi n)^{-1/2}\exp(-p^2/n)$. This indicates that the population distribution of different order quantum transitions is extremely nonuniform in the spin ensemble. In general, the lower order quantum transitions such as zero-, single-, and double-quantum transitions are much more than those higher-order quantum transitions in a spin ensemble. The spectral intensity of the $p-$order quantum transition is generally proportional to the probability of the $p-$order quantum transition in the distribution, although this is not absolute. Therefore, it is better to choose lower order quantum transition spectral peaks such as zero-, single- or double-quantum transitions to help the searching for the period r in the factoring algorithm.

It has been shown in previous sections that the total conversion efficiency $I_y(m)/I_{i0}$ of the multiple-quantum coherences is almost independent of the qubit number n when m is not a zero point and both the conditions (52a) and (52b) are met. Because there are only $(2n+1)$ spectral peaks in the multiple-quantum spectrum, on average, each peak intensity is approximately inversely proportional to the qubit number n even when the integer $m = 1$. Then there are at least some peaks among the $2n+1$ peaks, for example, the $p-$order multiple-quantum peak, which intensity $I_y(p, m)$ can be detected precisely without an exponential resource. Consequently, with the factoring sequence in previous sections one can fix experimentally the zero points $m_0 = kr/2$ $(k = 0, 1, ...,)$ from a small neighbor region ($m_0 \pm 1$ at least) of the zero points without an exponential resource, and thus the factoring sequence is locally efficient in a small neighbor region of the zero points at least. However, it is not clear whether the factoring sequence is yet efficient or not when the searching for the zero points starts at those time points m far from the zero points. The time development behavior of the long-range-interaction and higher-order multiple-quantum spectral intensities may play an important role to find efficiently the zero points when the searching for the zero points starts at those points far from the zero points. The time development behavior is dependent on the Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ of the modular exponential operation. The numerical simulation using the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(27) shows that the zero-quantum peak $I_y(p = 0, m = 1)$ is stronger than any other multiple-quantum peaks when the integer $y = 2, 4, ...,$ and is much smaller than N. The simulation also shows that some nonzero-order quantum peaks are also quite strong even for a large integer N and the smallest integer $y = 2$, although the zero-quantum peak is still strongest. This implies that the Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ with a small integer $y = 2, 4, ...$ and a large integer N still have a quite large multiple-quantum coherence component H_1 in addition to the strongest zero-quantum coherence operator H_0, so that the strong zero-quantum peak falls off rapidly as the integer m and the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ approaches rapidly to its the steady state. However, the searching for the zero points using the zero-quantum peak or other multiple-quantum peaks is still locally efficient, that is, if the initial integer m is sufficiently near the zero points then the zero points can be found efficiently even for a large number N with the help of the time development behavior of the zero-quantum peak or other multiple-quantum peaks. The searching for the zero points based on the time development behavior of the $p-$order quantum peak may become really inefficient when the searching starts from those points m far from the zero points. For an integer $y \neq 2, 4, ...$, or for a large integer y the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(25) approaches quickly to its steady state as the integer m. One of the reasons for it could be that the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ of Eq.(21) is very special in the factoring sequence, that is, $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ is the unity operator. It can be known from Eq.(56) that if the initial density operator $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ is a $LOMSO$ operator then the multiple-quantum coherences created by the conditional modular exponential operation $U_{I_{n_i}S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ belong to each isolated subset $S(x_l) \times S(x_l)$ and the maximum number ($\sim \frac{1}{2}(r^2 - r)$) of multiple-quantum transitions in the subset $S(x_l) \times S(x_l)$ usually is much less than the maximum number $\frac{1}{2}(4^n - 2^n)$ of multiple-quantum transitions of the subensemble S_n with n spins-1/2. In particular, the maximum number of multiple-quantum transitions induced by the conditional modular exponential operation on the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ of Eq.(21) is not more than $(N - 1)$ ($\frac{1}{2}2^n \leq N < 2^n$) for any given integer m. This can be seen from the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ of Eq.(27). This number is greatly less than the maximum number $\frac{1}{2}(4^n - 2^n)$. This could be one of the reasons why the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ (27) enters into its steady state rapidly as the integer m. In the future it will be studied in detailed how the initial density operator $\rho_{S_n}(0)$ is chosen properly to overcome the steady state problem.

A possible scheme to overcome the steady-state problem is described below from the point of view of manipulating the Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ of the modular exponential operation. First one finds a unitary operator $G(y, r, N)$ so that the transformed Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(y, r, N)$ has a dominating zero-quantum coherence component:

$$\hat{H}(y, r, N) = G(y, r, N)^{+} H(y, r, N) G(y, r, N).$$

Then this new Hamiltonian is acted on the initial density operator by replacing the original Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ of the modular exponential operation, and the generated multiple-quantum spectra could be able to be used to efficiently find the period r. The unitary operator $G(y, r, N)$ always exists, but it is a challenge how to find the exact unitary operation $G(y, r, N)$ that can be implemented in polynomial time. The Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ always can be diagonalized unitarily. Assume that there is a unitary operator $V(y, r, N)$ to diagonalize the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$:

$$V(y, r, N)^{+}U(y, r, N)V(y, r, N) = \Lambda(y, r, N). \tag{70}$$

The unitary operator $V(y, r, N)$ can be constructed from the Fourier transforms (12a) and (12b), but it contains the period r in an explicit form and this makes it difficult to construct its explicit quantum circuit. But the unitary operator $V(y, r, N)$ could be built up approximately. The Fourier transform (12a) over the period r_{x_l} may be replaced with the following approximated Fourier transform over the whole range of the integer N [2, 3, 4, 6, 7]:

$$|\Psi_s(x_l)\rangle \approx \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \exp(i2\pi sk/N)|x_l y^k \bmod N\rangle. \tag{71}$$

If the period r divides the integer N then the Fourier transform (71) is exact. But the period r usually does not divide the integer N. Therefore, the unitary operator $\hat{V}(y, N)$ built up with the Fourier transform (71) diagonalizes approximately the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$, that is, $V(y, N) \approx \hat{V}(y, r, N)$. The unitary operator $\hat{V}(y, N)$ does not explicitly depend on the period r and has a polynomial quantum circuit since the Fourier transform (71) can be constructed efficiently [2, 3, 4, 6, 7]. By using the unitary operator $\hat{V}(y, N)$ to diagonalize approximately the Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ the diagonal unitary operator is obtained: $\hat{V}(y, N)^{+}U(y^m, r, N)\hat{V}(y, N)$. Then one chooses further a proper unitary operator $W(y, N)$, which Hamiltonian has a dominating zero-quantum coherence component and a relative small multiple-quantum component, to construct the desired unitary operator:

$$\hat{U}(y, r, N)^m = W(y, N)^{+}\hat{V}(y, N)^{+}U(y^m, r, N)\hat{V}(y, N)W(y, N). \tag{72}$$

Therefore, the unitary operator $G(y, r, N)$ that converts the Hamiltonian $H(y, r, N)$ into the desired Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(y, r, N)$ which has a dominating zero-quantum coherence component may be approximated by the unitary operator $G(y, N)$ which does not explicitly depend on the period r and is given by

$$G(y, r, N) \approx G(y, N) = \hat{V}(y, N)W(y, N). \tag{73}$$

Obviously, the unitary operator $\hat{U}(y, r, N)$ satisfies $\hat{U}(y, r, N)^m = E$ when $m = kr$ $(k = 0, 1, 2, ...,)$, indicating that the unitary operator $\hat{U}(y, r, N)$ has all the periods of the original unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$. Generally the unitary operator $W(y, N)$ is chosen suitably so that the unitary operator $\hat{U}(y, r, N)$ has not any other periods except the own periods of the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$. Now the new unitary operation (72) places the original unitary operation $U(y, r, N)$ in the factoring sequence in previous sections. Then in the searching for the zero points the initial density operator $\rho(0)$ of the spin ensemble $(I_{n_i} S_n)$ is converted efficiently into the zero-quantum coherence quickly at a short time, e.g., $m = 1$, under the conditional unitary operation $\hat{U}_{I_{n_i} S_n}(y, r, N)^m$ since the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(y, r, N)$ has a dominating zero-quantum coherence component. Therefore, the dominating zero-quantum coherence component of the Hamiltonian governs the time evolution behavior of the spin ensemble at a short time and is responsible for precisely distinguishing the zero points from other time points in the time region near the zero points $\rho(kr)$ without an exponential resource, while the relative small multiple-quantum coherence component of the Hamiltonian will be responsible for the efficient searching for the zero points starting from those time points far from the zero points.

According to the factoring sequence in previous sections one may find a zero point $m = r'$ by searching for the zero points of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$, but the zero point r' could not be the minimum period r of the modular exponential function. Suppose the period r is an even integer as before. Obviously, the ratio r'/r can only take a half integer $(2k + 1)/2$, an even integer $2k$, or an odd integer $(2k + 1)$, $k = 0, 1, 2, ...$ If the ratio r'/r is a half integer, i.e., $r'/r = (2k + 1)/2$ then the modular exponential function $f(y, r', N) = y^{r'} \bmod N = y^{r(2k+1)/2} \bmod N = y^{r/2} \bmod N$. One can use directly the function $f(y, r', N)$ to determine the non-trivial factor of the integer N if the function $f(y, r', N) \neq -1$. The non-trivial factor takes either $\gcd(f(y, r/2, N) - 1, N)$ or $\gcd(f(y, r/2, N) + 1, N)$ [1, 2, 3]. Therefore, one needs merely to find a half-integer zero point r' satisfying $r'/r = (2k+1)/2$ to factor the integer N. Suppose that the factoring sequence finds a zero point r'. One uses the zero point r' to calculate the function $f(y, r', N)$ which will take about $O((\log_2 N)^3)$ steps [1, 2]. If $f(y, r', N) = 1$ then $r'/r = 2k$ or $2k + 1$, otherwise $r'/r = (2k + 1)/2$. For the case $r'/r = 2k$ or $2k + 1$ one further calculates the function $f(y, r'/2, N)$ by using the integer $r'/2$, that is, $f(y, r'/2, N) = y^{r'/2} \bmod N$. If now $f(y, r'/2, N) \neq \pm 1$ one can use the function $f(y, r'/2, N)$ to find further a non-trivial factor of the integer N; otherwise $f(y, r'/2, N) = 1$ and $r'/2 = kr$. For the case $r'/2 = kr$ one calculates the function $f(y, r'/4, N)$ again. If $f(y, r'/4, N) \neq \pm 1$ one will obtain a correct function $f(y, r'/4, N)$ to factor the integer N, otherwise calculate further $f(y, r'/8, N)$. Therefore, by $p = O(n)$ steps at most to calculate the function $f(y, r'/2^k, N)$, $k = 0, 1, 2, ..., p-1$ one can finally find a correct function $f(y, r'/2^{p-1}, N)$ to factor the integer N. If the period r is not an even integer or $f(y, r', N) = y^{r'} \bmod N = -1$, meaning that one can not find a non-trivial factor of N by the function $f(y, r', N)$, one needs to choose another integer y coprime to the integer N [1, 2, 3] and then run the factoring sequence above to find a zero point r' so as to obtain the correct $f(y, r', N)$.

6. Discussion

In this paper a quantum factoring sequence based on the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics has been proposed to solve the prime factorization problem on a spin ensemble without any quantum entanglement. It uses the NMR multiple-quantum measurement techniques to output its quantum computational results. The NMR quantum computer can perform the modular exponential operation just like a classical digital computer, but its quantum computational output is the inphase multiple-quantum spectrum of the spin ensemble which may reduce merely in a polynomial form as the qubit number of the spin ensemble. The computational complexity of the modular exponential operation is the same on both the quantum computer and the classical one. Quantum entanglement is not involved in the present ensemble quantum computation of prime factorization because there is not any quantum entanglement in the spin ensemble used to perform the prime factorization. The time evolution process of the modular exponential operation on the quantum computer obeys the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics and hence the computational output is governed by the Liouville-von Neumann equation of quantum dynamics. This essential difference between the quantum computer and the classical one could be the key point for the quantum computation outperforming the classical one in the prime factorization on a spin ensemble without any quantum entanglement. It has been shown that the prime factorization based on the unitary dynamics of quantum mechanics on a spin ensemble is locally efficient at least. Therefore, the quantum entanglement could not be a unique resource to achieve speedup of quantum computation in the prime factorization on a spin ensemble and quantum dynamics could play an important role for the origin of power of quantum computation. The steady-state problem is a harmful problem. It hampers the present factoring sequence to find efficiently the period of the modular exponential function. It is worth studying in detailed in the future how the steady-state problem is dependent on the initial density operator of the factoring sequence and how the steady-state problem may be overcome by manipulating the Hamiltonian of the modular exponential operation.

There are a number of works [30, 31] to describe how to construct efficiently the quantum circuit of the modular exponential unitary transformation $U(y, r, N)$ in a quantum system with qubit number much more than $(1 + [\log_2 N])$, where a large number of extra auxiliary qubits are used. The construction of the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$ may be easier in a quantum system with a larger Hilbert space, that is, with a larger number of qubits. However, in practice it is still a challenge to construct efficiently the quantum circuit of the unitary operator $U(y, r, N)$ in a spin ensemble with $(1 + [\log_2 N])$ qubits at least. The implementation for the Shor$'$s factoring algorithm on a quantum system need consume a number of qubits, but if the modular exponential operation could be implemented efficiently on a spin ensemble with qubits as low as $(1+[\log_2 N])$ then this would simplify greatly the implementation of the prime factorization.

Multiple-quantum coherences are generally measured indirectly through the detection of single quantum coherence in NMR spectroscopy. The measurement is more time-consuming than the direct detection of single quantum coherence. However, the importance is that the measurement time for each running of the factoring sequence based on the NMR multiple-quantum spectroscopic method is almost independent of qubit number of a spin ensemble. If digital resolution to record experimentally NMR multiple-quantum signal needs to keep constant then the consuming time is approximately linearly dependent on the qubit number since the spectral width to cover over all $2n+1$ multiple-quantum spectral peaks is about $2n\omega_S$, approximately proportional to the qubit number n. Therefore, the measurement is not a severe computational complexity problem in the factoring sequence. An improved method to overcome the time-consuming problem of multiple-quantum coherence indirect measurement might be using one-dimensional multiple-quantum filtering experiments in NMR spectroscopy [19]. The one-dimensional experiments should employ gradient magnetic field [32] instead of the phase cycling to select the multiple-quantum coherence with desired quantum order before detection and then convert it into single quantum coherence to be detected directly. In the one-dimensional experiments the antisymmetric property of the density operator $\rho_y(m)$ might be useful for the speedup of the searching for the zero points of the density operator. However, there are some problems to be solved for the one-dimensional experiments to be used in the NMR quantum computation, for example, how to convert efficiently the desired order quantum coherences into inphase single quantum coherence which can be detect efficiently.

Relaxation or decoherence effect in a spin ensemble is usually harmful for any ensemble quantum computation, but it might be harmless for the searching for the zero points in the factoring sequence on a spin ensemble. Since the NMR multiple-quantum coherences usually decay in an exponential form and irreversibly as the time development in a spin ensemble then the time development behavior of the multiple-quantum spectral peaks such as the zero-quantum peak used to search for the zero points may become more distinct in the region near to the zero points so that the searching might become more efficient. However, the decoherence effect may destroy the efficient detection for multiple-quantum coherences and especially for those higher-order quantum coherences due to the fact that a higher-order quantum coherence usually has a shorter relaxation time and its NMR signal usually decays much more rapidly than those lower order quantum coherences in a spin ensemble. Therefore, relaxation effect is a compromised effect on the present prime factorization on an NMR quantum computer.

References

1. P.W.Shor, Algorithms for quantum computation: Discrete logarithms and factoring, Proc. 35th annual symposium on foundations of computer science, IEEE computer society press, Los Alamitos, CA, pp. 124-134

2. P.W.Shor, Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer, SIAM J.Comput. 26, 1484-1509 (1997)

3. A.Ekert and R.Jozsa, Quantum computation and Shor′s factoring algorithm, Rev.Mod.Phys. 68, 733 (1996)

4. R.Cleve, A.Ekert, C.Macchiavello, and M.Mosca, Quantum algorithms revisited, Proc.R.Soc.Lond.A 454, 339 (1998)

5. A.Kitaev, Quantum measurements and the Abelian stabiliser problem, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9511026 (1995)

6. R.Jozsa, Quantum algorithm and the Fourier transform,

http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9707033 (1997) and Proc.R.Soc.Lond.A 454, 323 (1998)
7. R.Jozsa, Quantum factoring, discrete logarithms and the hidden subgroup problem, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0012084
8. L.M.K.Vandersypen, M.Steffen, G.Breyta, C.S.Yannoni, M.H.Sherwood, and I.L.Chuang, Experimental realization of Shor′s quantum factoring algorithm using nuclear magnetic resonance, Nature 414, 883 (2001)
9. A.Ekert and R.Jozsa, Quantum algorithms: entanglement-enhanced information processing, Phil.Trans.Roy.Soc.Lond.A 356, 1769 (1998)
10. R.Raz, Exponential separation of quantum and classical communication complexity, Proc. 31st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 358 (1999)
11. A.Ekert, Quantum cryptography based on Bell′s theorem. Phys.Rev.Lett. 67, 661 (1991)
12. S.Lloyd, Quantum search without entanglement,
Phys.Rev. A61, 010301(R) (1999)
13. D.A.Meyer, Sophisticated quantum search without entanglement.
Phys.Rev.Lett. 85, 2014 (2000)
14. S.Parker and M.B.Plenio, Efficient factorization with a single pure qubit and $\log_2 N$ mixed qubits. Phys.Rev.Lett. 85, 3049 (2000)
15. E.Knill and R.Laflamme, On the power of one bit of quantum information, Phys.Rev.Lett. 81, 5672 (1998)
16. S.Parker and M.B.Plenio, Entanglement simulations of Shor′s algorithm, http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0102136 (2001)
17. S.Braunstein, C.M.Caves, R.Jozsa, N.Linden, S.Popescu, and R.Schack, Separability of very noisy mixed states and implications for NMR quantum computing, Phys.Rev.Lett. 83, 1054 (1999)
18. A.Abragam, Principles of nuclear magnetism, (Oxford University Press, London, 1961)
19. R.R.Ernst, G.Bodenhausen, and A.Wokaun, Principles of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance in One and Two Dimensions, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1987)
20. R.Freeman, Spin Choreography, (Spektrum, Oxford, 1997)
21. X.Miao, Universal construction of unitary transformation of quantum computation with one- and two-body interactions,
http://arXiv.gov/abs/quant-ph/0003068 (2000)
22. X.Miao, Universal construction for the unsorted quantum search algorithms, http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0101126 (2001)

23. X.Miao, A polynomial-time solution to the parity problem on an NMR quantum computer, http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0108116 (2001)
24. X.Miao, Solving the quantum search problem in polynomial time on an NMR quantum computer, http://arXiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0206102
25. See for example, E.Jiang, K.Gao, and J.Wu, Linear algebra, (in Chinese), (The People$'s$ Education Press, 1978)
26. Y.S.Yen and A.Pines, Multiple-quantum NMR in solids, J.Chem.Phys. 78, 3579 (1983)
27. W.K.Rhim, A.Pines, and J.S.Waugh, Violation of the spin-temperature hypothesis, Phys.Rev.Lett. 25, 218 (1970)
28. Loo Keng Hua, An introduction to number theory, (in Chinese), (Science Press, Beijing, 1957)
29. X.Miao, Multiple-quantum operator algebra spaces and description for the unitary time evolution of multilevel spin systems, Molec.Phys. 98, 625 (2000)
30. D.Beckman, A.N.Chari, S.Devabhaktuni, and J.Preskill, Efficient networks for quantum factoring, Phys.Rev. A 54, 1034 (1996)
31. V.Vedral, A.Barenco, and A.Ekert, Quantum networks for elementary arithmetic operation, Phys.Rev. A54, 147 (1996)
32. J.Keeler, R.T.Clowes, A.L.Davis, and E.D.Laue, Methods in Enzymology, Vol. 239, p. 145, (Academic Press, San Diego, 1994)